| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/017,654 | 12/12/2001 | Akseli Anttila | NC28554;BW04770.00031 | 7848 |

22907     7590     07/16/2008
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
1100 13th STREET, N.W.
SUITE 1200
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-4051

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| DIVECHA, KAMAL B |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2151 | |

| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 07/16/2008 | PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 May 2008</u>.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL.**     2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-20,23-25,30-33 and 36-41</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-20,23-25,30-33 and 36-41</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>20080509</u>

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-20, 23-25, 30-33, 36-41 are pending in this application.

Claims 21-22 and 26-29 were previously withdrawn.

Claim 35 was previously cancelled.

Claims 40-41 are newly added.

Claims 34-35 are cancelled in response filed 5/9/08.


### *Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114*

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in

37 CFR 1.17(e), **was filed 5/9/08** in this application after final rejection. Since this application is

eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e)

has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to

37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on **5/9/08** has been entered.


### *Response to Arguments*

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims above have been fully considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection, as necessitated by the substantial amendments.

Applicant is further suggested to refer to MPEP 2141.02(VI): In re Fulton: mere

disclosure of more than one alternative does not teach away from the combination because the

prior art does not criticize or discourage the usage of the alternatives; and MPEP 2143: rationales

for supporting the *prima facie case of obviousness.*

## *Information Disclosure Statement*

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 5/9/08 was filed after the

mailing date of the Final Rejection on 1/23/08.   The submission is in compliance with the

provisions of 37 CFR 1.97.   Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being

considered by the examiner.

## *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making
> and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it
> pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode
> contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

1.       Claims 1-20, 23-25, 30-33, 36 and 38-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first

paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Independent claim 1 recites:

A method, comprising:
        transmitting a media playback invite request received from a host terminal to a guest terminal,
wherein the media playback invite request includes a playback option enabling the guest terminal to request
different types of actions;
        relaying a media playback accept response from the guest terminal to the host terminal;
        distributing a start playback request from the host terminal to the guest terminal, wherein the start
playback request directs the guest terminal to begin a playback session of a media file in synchronization
with a beginning of the playback session at the host terminal;
        receiving an action request from the guest terminal, **wherein the action request includes the
playback option; and**
        **sending the playback option received from the guest terminal to the host terminal.**

In the written description, applicant discloses:

"...In one variation, invite request comprises various fields, including guest user id, session id, media file
id, host user id, playback options, playback scheduling, and a free text string of other media type that explains the
invitation to the guest users. **Playback options give specific guest users permission to request different types of
actions during playback session...**" (pg. 7 [25]).
        **"During the playback session, any of the active users can request a playback action. In order to do so,
an active user sends an action request to central server 107.** The action request message requests one of a

number of action types during playback session, including pause playback, rewind, fast-forward, user specified internal..." (pg. 12 [31]) (See also pg. 14 [40]).

Thus, the specification as filed clearly fails to teach, disclose and/or suggest the process of receiving an action request from the guest terminal **wherein the action request includes the playback option and sending the playback option received from the guest terminal** to the host terminal.

Stated another way, the specification as filed, fails to provide a support for the amendatory claim language, more specifically, for the subject matter in bold as set forth above.

At best understood, the specification discloses invite request message, wherein the invite message includes the playback option.

Hence, the claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 2-20, 23-25, 30-33, 36 and 38-41 are rejected for the same reasons as set forth above.


**Note:**

- The 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph rejections presented in the previous office action is withdrawn in light of the amendments filed 5/9/08.

- Since the specification fails to define the term "computer readable medium", the computer-readable medium is strictly interpreted as hardware/physical storage medium.

## *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the

claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various

claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any

evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out

the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c)

and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).


2.      Claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-19, 23-25 and 30-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Liou (WO 99/46702) in view of Dalrymple et al. (hereinafter Dalrymple, US

6,976,094 B1), and further in view of Handley et al. (hereinafter Handley, RFC 2327: SDP, April

1998).

As per claim 1, Liou discloses a method comprising:

distributing a start playback request from the host terminal to the guest terminal, wherein

the start playback request directs the guest terminal to being a playback session of a media file

that is locally stored in the guest terminal in synchronization with a beginning of the playback

session at the host terminal (fig. 10: joining and distributing play request, user 1, user 2, pg. 18 L4-32, pg. 14 L12-32: receiving messages and distributing to clients);

receiving an action request from the guest terminal, wherein the action request includes the playback option (fig. 10: receiving pause action from the terminal, pg. 18 L4 to pg. 19 L13: VCR commands); and

sending the playback option received from the guest terminal to the host terminal (fig. 10: sending the pause message).

However, Liou does not expressly disclose the process of transmitting a media playback invite request received from a host terminal to a guest terminal, wherein the media playback invite request includes a playback option enabling the guest terminal to request different types of actions and the process of relaying a media playback accept response from the guest terminal to the host terminal.

Dalrymple explicitly discloses a call set-up method during conferencing comprising the process of sending an invite request message from the host terminal to the guest terminal through a central server, and the process of relaying a media playback accept response from the guest terminal to the host terminal (i.e. standard approach for setting up a communication session and sending invitations in SIP protocol, fig. 2 step #100, 106, 108, 110, fig. 4, col. 3 L50 to col. 4 L46, col. 5 L23-50: the OK response message in SIP protocol by a node/terminal is to convey to the client that the action was successfully received, understood and accepted).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Liou in view of Dalrymple in order to invite the users and receive the response.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because this would have established a communication session between two computers through invitations (Dalrymple: col. 3 L50 to col. 4 L21).

However, Liou in view of Dalrymple does not disclose the media playback invite request including a playback option enabling the guest terminal to request different types of actions.

Handley explicitly discloses a session description protocol (SDP) including the process of sending the invitations to the users, wherein the invitations includes **various fields** comprising a playback option field for enabling the guest terminal to request different types of actions, i.e. enabling the receiver for interactive conferencing, i.e. for sending the actions (pg. 23: a= sendrecv field).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Liou and Dalrymple in view of Handley in order to include a playback option in the invitation.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because this would have enabled the receivers, i.e. users, to engage in an interactive conference (Handley: pg. 23).

As per claim 2, Liou discloses the method further comprising distributing the action request to another terminal during the playback session (pg. 6 L18-27, pg. 14 L12-33: receives action(s) and distributes to all session manager associated with the users, fig. 10).

As per claim 4, Liou discloses the method wherein the action request is selected from the group consisting of a rewind request, a pause playback request, a fast forward request, a textual comment request, and a user-specified internal effect algorithm to modify audio or video of the media file (pg. 11 L21-32, pg. 12 L12-25, fig. 4, fig. 10: pause action).

As per claim 5, Liou discloses the method comprising distributing a stop playback request from the host terminal to the guest terminal in response to the host user terminating the playback session (pg. 11 L21-32, pg. 12 L1-25: a stop button will stop the playback session, pg. 14 L12-32: distributing actions to the rest of the clients).

As per claim 6, Liou discloses the method further comprising storing an internal time in response to distributing a start playback request from the host terminal to the guest terminal, wherein the start playback request directs the guest terminal to being a playback session of a media file that is locally stored in the guest terminal in synchronization with the host terminal (pg. 7 L10-14) and providing an elapsed time since distributing the start playback request to third terminal when the third terminal joins the playback session during the playback session (pg. 6 L3-27: delaying, pg. 14 L12-24).

As per claim 8, Liou discloses the method further comprising receiving a stop playback request from the guest terminal in response to the guest user withdrawing from the playback session (pg. 11 L21-32, pg. 12 L1-25: a stop button will stop the playback session); and removing a session entry that is associated with the guest terminal, wherein the session entry indicates participation of the guest terminal in the playback session (pg. 14 L12-23: managing state of the conference).

As per claim 9, Liou discloses the method further comprising receiving a stop playback request from the host terminal in response to the host user ending the playback session and terminating the playback session in response to receiving a stop playback request (pg. 11 L21-32, pg. 12 L1-25: a stop button will stop the playback session).

As per claim 10, Liou discloses the method further comprising instructing the guest terminal to modify the media file in accordance with a modification file during the playback session (fig. 4, pg. 7 L29 to pg. 8 L6: client loads one of video and recorded annotation file in a user interface for performing annotation of the video file, i.e. annotating/modifying the media file in accordance with the recorded annotation file, pg. 12 L12-25: recording annotations in accordance with a text edit window, pg. 19 L9-13: annotate during the playback of recorded annotation file, commanding to draw annotation based on the received annotation record, i.e. a modification file).

As per claim 13, Liou discloses the computer readable medium further comprising instructions to perform distributing a stop playback request from the host terminal to the guest terminal (fig. 10).

However, Liou does not disclose distributing a stop playback request to at least one other terminal in response to host terminal user terminating the playback session.

Dalrymple discloses multiple guest terminals and//or users engaging in playback session utilizing SIP protocol (col. 4 L31-47).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Liou in view of Dalrymple in order to distribute the stop request to at least one other terminal.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because it would have enabled playback and/or conference session with multiple users (Dalrymple: col. 4 L31-47).

As per claim 14, Liou discloses a method comprising:

distributing/sending a start playback request from the host terminal to the guest terminal, wherein the start playback request directs the guest terminal to being a playback session of a media file that is locally stored in the guest terminal in synchronization with a beginning of the playback session at the host terminal (fig. 10: joining and distributing play request, user 1, user 2, pg. 18 L4-32, pg. 14 L12-32: receiving messages and distributing to clients);

receiving an action request from the guest terminal, wherein the action request includes the playback option (fig. 10: receiving pause action from the terminal, pg. 18 L4 to pg. 19 L13: VCR commands); and

modifying the playback session of the media file in response to the action request (fig. 10: sending the pause message and/or VCR controls such as rewind will modify the media file, pg. 11 L21-32, pg. 12 L12-25, fig. 4, fig. 10: pause action).

However, Liou does not expressly disclose the process of transmitting a media playback invite request received from a host terminal to a guest terminal, wherein the media playback invite request includes a playback option enabling the guest terminal to request different types of actions and the process of relaying a media playback accept response from the guest terminal to the host terminal.

Dalrymple explicitly discloses a call set-up method during conferencing comprising the process of sending an invite request message from the host terminal to the guest terminal through a central server, and the process of relaying a media playback accept response from the guest terminal to the host terminal (i.e. a standard approach for setting up a communication session and sending invitations in SIP protocol, fig. 2 step #100, 106, 108, 110, fig. 4, col. 3 L50 to col. 4

L46, col. 5 L23-50: the OK response message in SIP protocol by a node/terminal is to convey to the client that the action was successfully received, understood and accepted).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Liou in view of Dalrymple in order to invite the users and receive the response.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because this would have established a communication session between two computers through invitations (Dalrymple: col. 3 L50 to col. 4 L21).

However, Liou in view of Dalrymple does not disclose the media playback invite request including a playback option enabling the guest terminal to request different types of actions.

Handley explicitly discloses a session description protocol (SDP) including the process of sending the invitations to the users, wherein the invitations includes various fields comprising a playback option field for enabling the guest terminal to request different types of actions, i.e. enabling the receiver for interactive conferencing, i.e. for sending the actions (pg. 23: a= sendrecv field).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Liou and Dalrymple in view of Handley in order to include a playback option in the invitation.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because this would have enabled the receivers, i.e. users, to engage in an interactive conference (Handley: pg. 23).

As per claim 30, Liou discloses the method wherein the media file is locally stored on the guest terminal for playback (pg. 6 L3-10).

As per claims 11-12, 15-19, 23-25, 31-33, they do not teach or further define over the limitations in claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-10, 13, 14 and 30. Therefore, claims 11-12, 15-19, 23-25, 31-33 are rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-10, 14 and 30.

3.      Claims 36-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liou (WO 99/46702) in view of Dalrymple et al. (hereinafter Dalrymple, US 6,976,094 B1), and further in view of Kumar et al. (hereinafter Kumar, US 6,006,253).

As per claim 36, Liou discloses an apparatus (i.e. a host and/or guest terminal, pg. 10 L1-24, for use in a synchronous media playback system) comprising:

a processor (pg. 10 L1-24); and

memory (pg. 6 L3-10) storing computer-executable instructions that when executed (pg. 10 L1-24, fig. 1: plurality of host terminals), perform:

receiving at the apparatus a start playback request, wherein the start playback request begins a playback session of the media file in synchronization with a beginning of the playback session at a terminal (fig. 10: joining and distributing play request, user 1, user 2, pg. 18 L4-32, pg. 14 L12-32: receiving messages and distributing to clients);

subsequent to receiving the start playback request, transmitting an action request to the server, wherein the action request includes the playback option (fig. 10: receiving pause action from the terminal, pg. 18 L4 to pg. 19 L13: VCR commands and sending the pause message).

However, Liou does not expressly disclose the process of receiving at the apparatus a media playback invitation from a server, wherein the media playback invitation is for a playback session of a media file, and wherein the media playback invitation includes a playback option

enabling the apparatus to request different types of actions and responsive to receiving the media playback invitation, transmitting a media playback accept response to the server, wherein if the apparatus does not have the media file, the apparatus downloads the media file before transmitting the media playback accept response.

Dalrymple explicitly discloses a call set-up method during conferencing comprising the process of sending an invite request message from the host terminal to the guest terminal through a central server, i.e. receiving at the apparatus an invitation from the server, wherein the invitation is for playback session of a media file, and responsive to receiving the media playback invitation, transmitting a media playback accept response to the server (i.e. a standard approach for setting up a communication session and sending invitations in SIP protocol, fig. 2 step #100, 106, 108, 110, fig. 4, col. 3 L50 to col. 4 L46, col. 5 L23-50: the OK response message in SIP protocol by a node/terminal is to convey to the client that the action was successfully received, understood and accepted).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Liou in view of Dalrymple in order to invite the users and receive the response.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because this would have established a communication session between two computers through invitations (Dalrymple: col. 3 L50 to col. 4 L21).

However, Liou in view of Dalrymple does not disclose the media playback invite request including a playback option enabling the guest terminal to request different types of actions and

the process wherein if the apparatus does not have the media file, the apparatus downloads the media file before transmitting the media playback accept response.

Kumar discloses the SDP comprising sending an announcement, i.e. invitations, including a playback option, i.e. field for indicating mode of operation such as sendonly, sendrecv or recvonly, enabling the guest terminal to request different types of actions i.e. enabling the receiver for interactive conferencing, i.e. for sending the actions (fig. 6 item #650, col. 10 L11-44), and the process of downloading the media file if the apparatus does not have the media file (col. 7 L25-55: note that the invitations and/or announcement enables the user to download the slides before and/or after the user transmits the accept response).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Liou and Dalrymple in view of Kumar in order to include a playback option in the invitation and download the media filed before transmitting the accept message.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because this would have enabled the receivers, i.e. users, to engage in an interactive conference regarding the media file.

As per claim 38, Liou and Dalrymple discloses the apparatus wherein the processor utilizes the communication interface to communicate to a central server, wherein the central server receives and forwards invitations and responses between the apparatus and the terminal (Liou: pg. 10 L1-24, pg. 14 L12-32, fig. 1, fig. 10; Dalrymple: fig. 2-4, pg. 16 L21-27).

As per claim 39, Liou discloses the apparatus wherein the processor includes instructions to perform modifying the media file in accordance with a modification file during the playback session (fig. 4, pg. 7 L29 to pg. 8 L6: client loads one of video and recorded annotation file in a

user interface for performing annotation of the video file, i.e. annotating/modifying the media

file in accordance with the recorded annotation file, pg. 12 L12-25: recording annotations in

accordance with a text edit window, pg. 19 L9-13: annotate during the playback of recorded

annotation file, commanding to draw annotation based on the received annotation record, i.e. a

modification file).

As per claim 37, it does not teach or further define over the limitations in claims 36, 38-

39. Therefore claim 37 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 36, 38-39.


4.       Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liou (WO

99/46702) in view of Dalrymple et al. (hereinafter Dalrymple, US 6,976,094 B1), and further in

view of Handley et al. (hereinafter Handley, RFC 2327: SDP, April 1998), and further in view of

Kumar et al. (hereinafter Kumar, US 6,006,253).

As per claim 40, Liou, Dalrymple and Handley disclose the method as in claim 1 as set

forth above.

However, Liou, Dalrymple and Handley does not disclose the method wherein if the

guest terminal does not have the media file, the guest terminal downloads the media file before

sending the media playback accept response.

Kumar discloses the process of downloading the media file if the apparatus does not have

the media file (col. 7 L25-55: note that the invitations and/or announcement enables the user to

download the slides before and/or after the user transmits the accept response).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Liou, Dalrymple and Handley in view of Kumar in order to download the media filed before transmitting the accept message.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because it would have enabled the receivers, i.e. users, to engage in an interactive conference regarding the media file.

5.      Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liou (WO 99/46702) in view of Dalrymple et al. (hereinafter Dalrymple, US 6,976,094 B1), in view of Handley et al. (hereinafter Handley, RFC 2327: SDP, April 1998), and further in view of Crandall et al. (hereinafter Crandall, US 2002/0107040 A1).

As per claim 7, Liou, Dalrymple and Handley disclose the process of receiving a host internal time from the host terminal or the guest terminal, wherein the host internal time is derived from a global time (Liou: pg. 6 L3-27, pg. 14 L12-24, pg. 7 L10-14).

However, Liou, Dalrymple and Handley does not expressly disclose the process of comparing the host internal time to a guest internal time in order to derive a time difference, wherein the guest internal time is derived from the global time; and adjusting transmission of a subsequent message to the host terminal or the guest terminal (Liou may inherently teach the process).

Crandall discloses the process of synchronizing messages by determining host time and guest time, comparing the host time with the guest time in order to derive time difference, i.e. delay, and adjusting the transmission of a subsequent message to the host terminal (fig. 4, fig. 5, fig. 7, fig. 9, pg. 2 [0030-0034], pg. 3 [0044-0046], pg. 4 [0047-0057]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time
the invention was made to modify Liou, Dalrymple and Handley in view of Crandall in order to
derive a time difference and adjust the transmission of the messages.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because it would have
provided same amount of latency for different users and/or actions (Crandall, pg. 1 [0005]).


6.      Claims 3, 20 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liou
(WO 99/46702) in view of Dalrymple et al. (hereinafter Dalrymple, US 6,976,094 B1), in view
of Handley et al. (hereinafter Handley, RFC 2327: SDP, April 1998), and further in view of
Agresta et al. (hereinafter Agresta, US 2002/0091848 A1).

As per claim 3, Liou, Dalrymple and Handley does not disclose the process of verifying
permissions associated with the guest terminal, wherein the sending of the playback option
received from the guest terminal to the host terminal is responsive to verifying the permissions
associated with the guest terminal.

Agresta explicitly teaches the process of verifying the permissions, i.e. authoring account
before executing the process such as pause, rewind, forward, etc. (fig. 4A step #116, 138, pg. 6
[0051]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time
the invention was made to modify Liou, Dalrymple and Handley in view of Agresta in order to
verify the permissions of the terminals and/or users before executing any actions.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because it would have
verified the access rights of the user.

As per claim 20, Liou, Dalrymple and Handley do not disclose the system wherein the sending of the media playback invite request to the guest terminal, the sending of the start playback request to the guest terminal, the receiving of the media playback accept response from the guest terminal, and the receiving of the action request from the guest terminal are performed utilizing a wireless communications channel (i.e. the combination do not disclose wireless network).

Agresta explicitly teaches using the wireless communication channel and/or network (fig. 3 item #22, pg. 3 [0037]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Liou, Dalrymple and Handley in view of Agresta in order to employ the process over the wireless channel.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because it would have enabled the user to remote access data and/or engage in conference from any location (Agresta, pg. 3 [0037]).

As per claim 41, it does not teach or further define over the limitations in claims 3 and 20. Therefore, claim 41 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claims 3 and 20.


## *Additional References*

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Andreakis et al., US 6,816,895 B2: Updating the capability negotiation information of a mobile station with an editing application downloaded from service provider.

- Saxena et al., U. S. Patent No. 5,805,821.

- Agarwal et al., U. S. Patent No. 6,314,466 B1.

- Schmidt et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,353,174 B1.

- King et al., US 5,600,775: Method and apparatus for annotating full motion video.

- McLampy et al., US 7,133,923 B2: Real-Time Transport protocol.

## *Conclusion*

Examiner's Remarks: The teachings of the prior art should not be restricted and/or limited to the citations by columns and line numbers, as specified in the rejection. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in its entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

In the case of amendments, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and support, for ascertaining the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE NON-FINAL.**

   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KAMAL B. DIVECHA whose telephone number is (571)272-5863. The examiner can normally be reached on Increased Flex Work Schedule.

   If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 571-272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kamal Divecha
Art Unit 2151
/John Follansbee/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2151